DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 807 HE 029 405

AUTHOR Ward, Kelly
TITLE Service-Learning and Student Volunteerism: Reflections on Institutional Commitment.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Case Studies; Change Strategies; College Faculty; College Students; Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Higher Education; *Institutional Role; Interviews; *Leadership Responsibility; Private Colleges; Public Colleges; Questionnaires; *Service Learning; State Universities; Tribally Controlled Education; Volunteers

ABSTRACT

This study examined institutional support for service-learning within the framework of service-learning as a part of the national agenda for higher education since the late 1980s. This investigation addressed three concerns: (1) how campus administrators support (or fail to support) service-learning on their campus; (2) how different groups (e.g., faculty, staff, community agencies, students) perceive the support for service on their campus; and (3) what barriers and supports promote service-learning and volunteerism on campus. Five case studies were completed using individual interviews, student focus groups, and document analysis involving students, faculty, service-learning staff, community service agency personnel and administrators at five different institutional types: a community college, a tribally controlled college, a four-year public liberal arts college, a four-year private liberal arts college, and a state university. Findings indicated the faculty role in advancing service was tenuous and varied significantly by campus. Lack of funding was mentioned frequently as a barrier to effective implementation of service-learning. All the senior administrators interviewed gave great verbal support to service-learning, although actual supporting activity varied greatly by campus. Recommendations urge involvement of administrators, faculty, and students in planning for service-learning; clear articulation concerning integration of service-learning and volunteerism; and integration of service into institutional structures. (Contains 12 references.) (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 807

Service-Learning and Student Volunteerism: Reflections on Institutional Commitment

Kelly Ward
Service-Learning Director and
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Higher Education
The Montana Campus Compact
The University of Montana
302 University Hall
Missoula, MT 59812
406.243.5177
kward@selway.umt.edu

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 8-11, 1996, New York, New York.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kelly Ward
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE029 405

Service-Learning and Student Volunteerism: Reflections on Institutional Commitment

Introduction

A majority of postsecondary institutions in the United States have public service integrated into their philosophy and mission statements (Balderston, 1995). Some institutions are strongly grounded in an ethic of service and take seriously their role of preparing well-rounded citizens by engaging students in civic life as part of the academic experience, while other campuses only rhetorically fulfill their service missions. For institutions in the latter category, "service" is expressed in mission statements, but active public service on behalf of students, faculty, and administrators is not part of campus culture nor is it supported or rewarded.

As public support for higher education wanes and criticism and scrutiny increase, campus administrators look to the reinvigoration of their public service missions and the involvement of students in community service and volunteerism as a means to instill civic responsibility. Student and faculty participation in service to address local problems makes clear to surrounding communities and constituencies that higher education is contributing positively to local communities. The result has been increased interest in and support of campus-based student volunteer centers and the incorporation of service-learning into the undergraduate curriculum.

The increased and renewed interest in campus-based service has been spurred by a national wave of interest in service and service-learning--both on campus and off. Nationally, service

was brought politically to the fore by President Bush with the signing of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, an initiative to reinstill an ethic of service in communities across the nation. President Clinton then signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, thus creating the Corporation for National Service, which funds and administers service programs such as AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America.

Higher education's involvement in service is certainly not new. The history of higher education is very much grounded in an ethic of service (Morse, 1989; Rudolph, 1962), but in recent years the role of service for higher education has been unclear and in many instances ignored (Lynton, 1995). Several national organizations have taken initiative to congregate educational leaders to find ways for higher education to regain the public trust by examining campus culture and curricula for service. National Campus Compact, the American Association for Higher Education, the Council of Independent Colleges, and the National Society for Experiential Education (to name a few) have been leaders in igniting conversations about service and higher education's role in providing opportunities and infrastructure for public service on college campuses throughout the country.

Combined, national policy to promote service and campus conversations about service have inspired many administrators to make the integration of service on campus a goal for the 1990's. The ideals of service have been initiated in many communities and schools through programs supported by the Corporation for

National Service and other organizations. Philanthropists have also been generous in their support of service initiatives on campus (cf., Hudson & Trudeau, 1995).

Campuses have benefitted from funding, both small and large, to cultivate interest in community service. At this juncture it seems, however, that federal funding for service is in jeopardy and the federal role itself in service is being questioned by members of Congress (Liu, 1995). Does this mean that the renewed interest in service will pass? In a recent article in *Change* magazine Edward Ztlotkowski (1996), a senior associate of the American Association for Higher Education, challenges us to look critically at higher education's commitment to service as national support wanes. For service-learning to transcend its critics' cynicism as merely another fad for educational reform, then it must be integrated into campus cultures and central to organizational mission. Institutionalization is essential if service-learning is to survive on colleges campuses.

Drawing upon data from five case studies of institutions with a stated commitment to the integration of service, the study presented in this paper examines how these campuses are incorporating volunteerism and service-learning into organizational structures. Service-learning, as an area of study, is still relatively young and the research to date largely focuses on philosophical reasons for doing service-learning (cf., Morse, 1989), practical concerns for administrators and faculty implementing service (cf., Hatcher & Bringle, 1996), and student

outcomes (cf., Boss, 1994). Studies that have examined the institutionalization of service are either prescriptive (cf., Bringle & Hatcher, 1996), focus on one institution (cf., Hudson & Trudeau, 1995), or based on only one categorization of institutions (cf., Sagaria & Burrows, 1995).

This study is timely for it looks at institutional support for service-learning now that service has been part of the national agenda for higher education since the late 1980's. Administrators and faculty working to implement service are encountering issues that are new, not only to their campus, but to the field of service-learning as well. The campuses in the study have been committed to service-learning for at least three years, thus have had time to advance the integration of service. The information gleaned from the study is useful for faculty and administrators dedicated to integrating service into their campus culture.

The questions that direct this inquiry are:

(1) How do campus administrators support (or fail to support) service-learning on their campus?

(2) How do different groups (e.g., faculty, staff, community agencies, students) perceive the support for service on their campus?

(3) What barriers and supports exist to promote service-learning and volunteerism on campus?

Prior to addressing these research questions, I discuss frameworks for organizing in higher education and the implications these can have on the integration of service.

Organizational Theory: What It Tells Us About Higher Education

> When we study them [colleges and universities] as organizations, we see groups of people filling roles and working together toward the achievement of common objectives within a formal social structure. (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 1)

Assuming that the common goal is service-learning then an organizational perspective puts into context the roles of campus stakeholders--faculty, students, staff, administrators--as they work to integrate service-learning into campus culture. Different groups have both formal and informal roles in organizational governance (Balderston, 1995). Leadership is about clarifying and enacting the institutional mission including moving organizations toward their stated objectives in addition to allocating resources, representing the organization to external constituencies, and managing organizational planning and change (Balderston, 1995, p. 78).

Most postsecondary institutions are "loosely coupled" systems comprised of individual academic units with discretion concerning how they spend their time and where they focus their energies for the institution (Weick, 1976). These units are comprised of professionals who work autonomously from larger organizational structures (Birnbaum, 1988), thus making it difficult to promote and integrate something like service if there is not support from each unit to support institutional initiatives. Given this mode of organizing, the very campus

leaders who commit their campuses to something like service-learning and volunteerism, may in fact have little actual power to enforce their vision for service (Birnbaum, 1988).

While major innovations in higher education need administrative leadership, certain aspects of faculty work can be challenging for presidents and other senior administrators to "enforce" their visions and goals for the institutions. Many faculty spend considerable time focused on activities that lead them off campus (e.g., publication, conference presentations) which can contribute to a conflict in local service-oriented activities. Further, advanced computer technology makes it easy for faculty to be connected with disciplinary issues and their national colleagues as readily, if not more so, than with their colleagues on campus. Again, this outward focus tends to shift faculty energies away from the campus and the local community. Reward structures also influence faculty work. On many campuses there is increasing interest in research related activities and rewards tend to disproportionately favor excellence in research (including grant procurement) over teaching and service regardless of institutional type (Fairweather, 1993; Sagaria & Burrows, 1995). Although service-learning can enhance teaching, research, and service it is still largely viewed by faculty as a service and instructional initiative, and consequently faculty may steer away from service-learning for fear they will not be justly rewarded.

Thus, while initiatives like service-learning need presidential support to be institutionalized, they can also be hampered by the professional and autonomous nature of faculty work. Frederick Baldertson (1995), an organizational theorist in higher education, states that "leadership is an exercise in process rather than a matter of achieving preset goals." In terms of service-learning this means leaders need to focus on process (e.g., faculty rewards for service-learning) in addition to achieving certain service goals (e.g., number of hours students engage in volunteer work; a general education requirement for service-learning) in order for service to be institutionalized and integrated throughout the campus culture. Successful innovations need support from all stakeholders and in particular the faculty and administration.

Service-learning on many campuses is about change: Changing perspectives on public service and what has historically been meant by service for the campus; changing definitions of service to include institutional citizenship (i.e., faculty committee work) and public service (e.g., service-learning; research to help solve local problems); changing curricula to incorporate service-learning; and changing reward structures to include equitable rewards for innovative teaching that includes service-learning.

If service-learning is to be more than a "movement," a fashionable academic trend, it must be integrated into the foundation of the institution. In essence, service, and the role

of service in institutional mission, must be considered in the curriculum, student affairs, faculty work, and even fundraising, if it is to be integrated holistically and successfully. Otherwise it fulfills its role as a "fad" that will surely pass when the next wave of innovation comes along. Service is not something that can be incorporated into a class or two and then be called done; instead it is an opportunity to have entire campus structures reexamined and questioned for their efficacy in contributing to their local communities.

The Study: Service-Learning in Montana

The paper draws upon data derived from five case studies of institutions that belong to both national Campus Compact and the Montana Campus Compact[1] to see how they are moving forward with their stated intent to integrate and reinvigorate the ethic of service. These campuses have been chosen for their very involvement in Campus Compact, which requires the commitment of both financial and human resources. Further, members of the Campus Compact have stated their intent to institutionalize service-learning and volunteerism on their campuses.

There is considerable variation with regard to how each institution organizes its efforts to integrate service and how they work with the Montana Campus Compact. The Compact is

---

[1]National Campus Compact is a consortium of over 500 presidents with the commitment to re-enliven service on their campuses. In Montana, six presidents founded the Montana Campus Compact in 1993 to encourage collaboration among campuses on service-related initiatives, and to bring the national emphasis on service to Montana. Currently there are 14 member campuses in Montana.

largely a consulting organization. To join the Compact, member campuses pay dues (which automatically join them with national Campus Compact), and identify a service-learning administrator who is a liaison with the Compact office, and who will help integrate service on the campus. In some instances a person is hired to specifically manage volunteer and service efforts on the campus, and on other campuses, the contact person's duties with Campus Compact are in addition to other duties. There is also diversity in where the contact person (i.e., the service-learning administrator) is housed. Service-learning can be administered out of student affairs (e.g., cooperative education, career services); a particular academic department (e.g., business, social work); a college/division (e.g., honors college, arts and sciences); or a public service center (e.g., Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University). There is no set model of organizing for service-learning.

Following I describe the methodology used for the study, the findings, and the implications these findings have for the institutionalization of service. The paper concludes with recommendations for effective practice for the integration service-learning and volunteerism.

Methods

Five case studies were completed using qualitative research methods including individual interviews, student focus groups, and document analysis. The campuses participating in the study are representative of the campuses in the state and those

belonging to the Compact: a community college, a tribally controlled college, a four-year public liberal arts college, a four-year private liberal arts college, and a state university. In the Spring of 1995, 38 interviews with students, faculty, service-learning staff, administrators, and community service agency personnel were conducted.[2] The interviews were guided by a structured interview protocol, tape recorded, and later transcribed. The interview protocols had common questions, but were adapted for each group. The questionnaire was field tested and modified accordingly.

The protocol included questions about the institutionalization of community service, how service-learning efforts are organized, how service is supported (and by whom), motivations for joining the Compact, campus benefits of service-learning, milestones and road blocks in the integration of service, and institutional goals for service-learning and volunteersim.

Data Analysis

The interviews were analyzed using inductive content analysis. With this technique "the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis" (Patton, 1980, p. 306). Themes from the data were

---

[2]In this paper I rely mostly on the 24 interviews with administrators (including the service-learning administrators) and faculty.

derived based on what was in the data and not from predetermined ideas about the data.

The interview transcripts were analyzed by first reading and re-reading the data to learn more about their contents. The second step was to identify themes that emerged from the data and then to identify codes for each theme. The analysis of the data yielded a total of 122 codes many of which were not related to institutionalization. Fifty two of the codes were directly related to organizational factors (e.g., administrative support, funding) that inhibit or facilitate the integration of service and serve as the focal point of this paper. These 52 codes naturally fall into three broad categories: faculty, funding, and presidential support for service-learning. Prior to discussing these themes, I provide an overview of the institutions studied.

Campus Overviews

Big Sky State University: The president of Big Sky has been the chief supporter of service-learning at the state level and is also involved in national dialogue about service. On campus, the half-time administrator works to cultivate interest in both volunteerism and service-learning. The campus service-learning office is funded, in part, through the president's office, and the president has provided additional funds as needed to support student, staff, and faculty travel to service-learning functions. The major obstacle to implementing service-learning in the faculty ranks is shifting priorities toward research and away

from teaching and service. Faculty are reluctant to take on duties they perceive are tangential in the reward structures.

Reservation College: Reservation is a tribally controlled college and has been a leader in service-learning nationally. In the words of the academic dean, "we provide the vision and encouragement, the rest is up to the faculty" to integrate service-learning into their courses. The president has been very vocal in his support of service-learning and has largely delegated the task of implementation of day-to-day activities to the career services office, and the task of faculty and curricular development to the academic dean. The campus has attracted two external grants for service-learning projects which has allowed them to hire a full-time volunteer coordinator and an assistant. Beginning in fall 1996, all students are required to take at least one service-learning course as part of their graduation requirements.

Glacier Community College: The president of this campus is new and he is not the president that originally signed on with Campus Compact. He is not against the college's involvement with service, but he has not been very vocal about his vision for service on campus. The service-learning administrator is in student services and does service-learning coordination for only 10 hours a week. In addition to working with Campus Compact, the campus is part of a national initiative for service-learning in community colleges from whom they received a grant last year to develop a service-learning course in chemistry.

University of Providence: The University is a four-year private (religiously affiliated) liberal arts institution. The president was hired three years ago and the integration of service-learning was been part of his vision for the campus from the outset. He hired a service-learning administrator (initially half-time, and now three-quarter time), created a Service-learning Center, and initiated campus days of service (a day in the fall when the campus is closed and the campus community works on a service project together). The campus was a site for a Council of Independent Colleges grant that helped initiate service-learning and volunteerism on campus.

Big Valley State College: This campus has been a leader throughout the state for its success with service-learning. The campus is small and located in a very rural area. Historically, campus and community relationships have been tense. The chancellor, with impressive support from the faculty, has been instrumental in revising the institutional mission statement to be centered around service. The mission statement is often referred to by faculty and administrators in the campus interviews, and is displayed prominently throughout the campus. The Center for Service Learning has a student director and two faculty advisors that are very active in oversight and administration.

Findings: Recurring Themes

The data analysis yielded three major themes related to the organizational integration of service: (1) faculty

participation, (2) funding, and (3) leadership for service-learning.

Faculty Participation: The success of any organizational innovation in higher education hinges on the mutual support and advancement by both faculty and administration. Campus Compact is a presidential initiative and consequently all of the presidents at the institutions studied are, at least to some extent, in support of service-learning. The faculty role in advancing service, however, is very tenuous and varies significantly by campus. This difference in vision between faculty and administrators on some campuses can be attributed to the exclusion of faculty from initial conversations about service-learning. Faculty perceive service-learning as a presidential initiative, and thus may be reluctant to participate. Further, some faculty are simply unaware of the service agenda on their campus.

A student affairs administrator at the University of Providence had this to say about the difference between faculty and administrative visions for service-learning:

> The president is very supportive of service on campus. He is new to the campus and his whole inaugural speech was about service and community. Administratively, we have a lot of support, but in the faculty there are only pockets of support, it is not consistent.

This sentiment was echoed throughout the interviews with the service-learning administrators, and other administrators (not presidents) working on behalf of service-learning. Some feel that "faculty are reticent about taking on one more project."

On some campuses the efforts of the Compact were actually perceived as a barrier to integrating service because they (the Compact) are viewed as an agent of the administration. One of the service-learning administrators had this to say:

> When faculty see [people] from the Compact coming they say, 'Where is she published? What is her degree in?' and if they don't have the right pedigree, the faculty aren't interested. Faculty are very content oriented. Unless you're in their content area, they don't want anything to do with you.

Change never occurs rapidly. On most campuses there is a small cadre of faculty supportive of service-learning. Some faculty believe strongly in the merits of service-learning and have used it as a learning and teaching strategy for years.

The administration at Reservation is working with faculty incrementally and is slowly in bringing faculty aboard when they are ready and willing. The academic dean at Reservation College describes his approach to faculty development:

> There have been several trainings on campus to introduce service-learning and now we have to sit back. Unless faculty want to do service-learning and are ready to, it will just be an added burden. They [faculty] have to come to a point where they've got enough energy to devote to this task or it's not going to become a very high priority. If I [administrator] try to force it or if they [Compact] force themselves it wouldn't take, it just wouldn't work. Faculty need to have a motive first.

Faculty participation on some campuses is hindered because there are limited incentives to get involved. A faculty member at Providence has great ideas for service projects, but found limited funds available to help her enact her ideas. She wanted to take students off campus, but transportation costs were not covered by the institution.

> The institution doesn't always economically support you, so I have been fighting that battle now. Students take a computer class and the college provides computers. But the kids take a service-learning class and who fronts the money? The burden is on me to raise money so this is one class where I have to raise my own money.

Several of the service-learning administrators working in the area of faculty development found it difficult to get widespread support from faculty without changes in reward structures. The central administration supports service-learning, but on most campuses there are not yet structures in place to officially reward efforts surrounding service-learning. A service-learning administrator articulates her challenges with faculty development:

> The administration needs to lay it down and say that service-learning will be part of promotion and tenure. If faculty want to survive they have to look at P & T guidelines and stick within them and work toward them. Service-learning is not in there.

Promotion and tenure guidelines vary greatly between the institutions studied. At Big Sky State University there is a push for faculty to engage in research, grant procurement, and publication, which can undermine faculty willingness to take on a new initiative in the area of teaching if it is likely to go unrewarded. With the exception of Big Sky, the other campuses have specified teaching missions. The major barrier for implementing service for these faculty is time. Teaching loads on some campuses are very high and faculty feel too extended to try new teaching strategies. Incentives and willingness to try new things vary greatly by campus. The Big Valley campus is

working to include service-learning in promotion and tenure guidelines.

Funding: Almost every faculty member, administrator (with the exception of chief executive officers), and staff person associated with service-learning mentioned funding, and the lack thereof, as a barrier to effective implementation of service-learning on their campus. Most of the campuses have a part-time administrator that organizes volunteer and service-learning operations. In some instances the service-learning administrator works on several other projects (not necessarily related to service), thus they are unable to devote full attention to service-learning, which on most campuses is enough work for a full-time job.

Community service takes students off campus into local organizations. In some instances there are large numbers of students going into the community (on one campus all of the students in the freshman seminar--300+ students--do a service-learning project) and this requires administration and oversight. Organization costs money and every campus had difficulties with securing enough funds to effectively administer a service-learning office. In addition to funds for administering offices and programs, there is also a need to support costs associated with service-learning projects (e.g., travel, preparation of professional materials) if they are to happen successfully.

The administrator who oversees the service-learning office at the University of Providence put it this way:

> We can't say this [service-learning] is an important part of the college and then not put resources in to make it work. The budget for the office needs to be bigger. The coordinator can't do an effective job on a half time basis.

The original charter for the Compact allocated $3,000 in start up funds for campuses when they joined the membership. For some campuses, the start-up funds caused some problems, because what was started with the money had difficulty continuing:

> As far as funding, the Compact cannot meet the needs of individual institutions. I know there is a need to spread funding around, but it's not enough to get done what needs to get done or to continue what has been started.

Other campus personnel are worried about being able to maintain a service-learning office in light of fiscal constraints.

> A lot of the grant monies out there are for projects and supplies, but not so much for coordinating things. Getting things up and running is easier than sustaining it after the first six months or the fist year. I guess that's where I'm concerned with how to continue service-learning.

Most of the service-learning personnel are seeking external funds to maintain their offices thus adding to an already full workload. Grant writing can be a full-time job. Big Sky State University and Big Valley State College are the only campuses that run solely from institutional funds (in addition to the start up funds from Campus Compact). The other three campuses in the study, have at some point attracted external funds to support their program.

Leadership for Service-Learning: A recurring theme in the interviews was presidential support and leadership for service-learning and volunteerism. This finding is not a surprise given that the integration of service is, for the most part, a

presidential objective. While all the senior administrators interviewed and talked about in the interviews (with the exception of one new president) gave great verbal support to service-learning, how this was translated into action varied greatly by campus.

Big Valley State College recently revamped its institutional mission around the theme of service. The campus chancellor is very active in supporting service initiatives. She said, "Service to the community is just part of our philosophy; it is a natural thing to do." Further:

> We have a mission statement that specifically calls for incorporating community service into the curriculum. In addition to the mission statement we have values that we put in three categories and one is service. In order to meet our mission statement we use the Center for Service Learning, service-learning in the curriculum, and the goals of the Campus Compact.

Interviews with students from this same campus affirmed the importance of the mission statement and the support of the chancellor. The student director of the Center for Service-learning remarked:

> She [the chancellor] has been very supportive of this idea [service-learning] and it has become a strong part of our mission and values statement that we developed in the past year.

Service is not just part of a mission statement that no one reads or knows about. It is a very active initiative and the entire campus community--whether they embrace it or not--is familiar with the role of service at the institution. Throughout the past year, the campus has incorporated service into campus-wide convocations, introduced service to the faculty senate for

consideration in the promotion and tenure guidelines, and had service as a theme at the campus wide fall faculty orientation. Further, it is estimated by one of the faculty directors of the Center for Service Learning that 30 percent of the faculty are regularly using service-learning in their courses.

At the University of Providence the president is also very supportive of service-learning. He says:

> We are forging ahead with community service because this is an institutional commitment and it is part of the baccalaureate experience here. We will move ahead and put resources to it.

A faculty member from the same campus, however, expressed concern over the lack of funding for service projects: "The institution doesn't always economically support you [in service-learning]." Faculty participation on the campus is in "pockets" and there are a lot of faculty who are not interested in service-learning, and unsupportive of the president. "We are working on getting more faculty involved," commented the service-learning administrator.

Presidential support has been essential to the introduction of service on all the campuses. On some campuses, the presidents not only set the tone for service, they are instrumental in personally carrying it forward by joining the Compact, allocating resources to either initiate or maintain an office and personnel, in addition to making service-learning central to the organization. Granted, some feel that the presidential support is not enough. For example, at Glacier Community College, those interviewed were not sure of their president's vision for

service. He has said told the campus community he is supportive of integrating service, but respondents in the study were unclear as to how they would do that as an institution. Succinctly put: "Campus Compact is an organization of presidents and I wish my president was more involved."

Summary

Funding, especially in times of dwindling resources, is a constant stress to those charged with realizing the service missions on their campus. Large sums of money to carry forward a service agenda are not necessarily required, but certainly campus personnel need salaries, projects need funding, and faculty need incentives. Funding also has important symbolic qualities to those interviewed: they want their presidents to allocate resources to show support.

The findings from the study also support the familiar need to have faculty and administrative forces working together to implement service-learning. Those interviewed talked about both volunteerism and service-learning. The emphasis, however, was on service-learning, and the importance of curricular integration if service is to be institutionalized. The findings show that it can be difficult to solicit wide-scale support for service-learning from the faculty. The reasons for this vary by campus, but the results are the same: service-learning administrators caught in a precarious position between presidential vision and faculty participation.

Discussion

Higher education is in a unique position, perhaps more so than other social institution in this country, to involve diverse people in conversation and in community problem solving. Service-learning is a vehicle to bring different community and campus stakeholders together to meet community needs and invigorate social change. The findings make clear that successful service-learning takes vision, leadership, financial support, and faculty participation. Campus Compact can only facilitate the integration of service, it cannot create and enforce a service agenda on any particular campus. Campuses need to be ready to initiate change and all organizational actors need to be willing to work together toward that change.

In order for service-learning and volunteerism to make their way into campus culture both faculty and administrators must commit to its success. As the academic dean at Reservation made clear, you can initiate the integration of service on campus, but "you can't force it," especially with faculty. Most of the campuses are working to increase the number of students and faculty involved in service-oriented activities both in and out of the classroom. The integration of service-learning into the curriculum takes faculty support and not all campuses have been able to translate presidential vision into faculty action.

The campuses that have been most successful with the integration of service at the curricular level are small tightly coupled systems. Each unit in a such a system still has autonomy

and makes its own professional decisions; however, faculty are also routinely and actively involved in campus-level decision making. At Reservation College and Big Valley (both relatively small campuses with enrollments of 800 and 1100), the chief executive officers are regularly involved in conversations with students, faculty, and other administrators about the importance of service and service-learning for the campuses to fulfill their missions. And, perhaps most importantly, the presidential vision for service on those two campuses is not simply rhetoric. It is talked about, encouraged, and supported by the president and other senior administrators. For example, at Reservation College faculty meet with the academic dean once a month at which time ideas such as service-learning are introduced and support is solicited. Faculty have a strong voice in planning, directing, and implementing service-learning.

While a tightly coupled system may have an easier time integrating service, this does not mean that every tightly coupled campus has been successful with integrating service nor does it mean that loosely coupled systems are doomed to failure. Numerous campuses throughout the country, regardless of their mode of organizing, have impressively integrated service into their organizational culture.

The number one concern of the service-learning administrators is financial support, and the lack thereof, for their programs. They are chronically concerned about the well-being and advancement of service-learning and wonder about the

likelihood of their efforts to continue. In spite of these concerns, the service-learning administrators still feel the support of their chief executive officers, they just do not necessarily feel it directly through the allocation of resources. Finances are tight for all the institutions in the state. Perhaps, a confounding variable in the service-learning equation in Montana is the inability to spend already scarce resources on a new initiative when so many existing projects on campus are vying for scarce resources. This is one possible explanation for the gap between presidents cheering service-learning on, but then failing to support it with dollars, which, as one respondent said, is "the bottom line for this to work."

Goodwin Liu (1995), past program officer of higher education for the Corporation for National Service, speaks of the "hazards" of federal involvement with service. He cites problems associated with bureaucracy (read: paperwork) and evaluation as hazardous to the health of service programs in higher education. Both of these hazards have been labeled such because they bring potentially onerous external demands into the operations of higher education. The demands can be overwhelming (in the case of bureaucracy) and/or irrelevant and contrived (in the case of evaluation). To these hazards, based on the findings in this study, I would add money. Even though several campuses have been afforded the opportunity to try things they otherwise would not have been able to, the federal funds first created a "feast" of funds to help projects get started, and now many are suffering

the effects of "famine" and uncertainty about their ability to function in the future. Some campuses find themselves in a precarious position: they have a great idea (i.e., service-learning) for solving many of the problems they have with their constituencies, but find themselves unable to fund it. The findings for the study show that perhaps some of the campuses did not know what they were getting into when they signed on with Campus Compact. The Compact provides limited seed money to help campuses do initial and preliminary organization with consultation and support. The implementation and administration of service, however, has to take place at the campus level involving campus stakeholders.

Committing to the advancement of service on one's campus is no small task, and while some presidents have risen to the occasion, others have not taken very seriously their role in supporting the integration of service on their campus. No one is against service per se, but that does not mean they are active champions of it either. If a president talks about service-learning, joins Campus Compact, and identifies a person to administer service-related activities on the campus it is not a guarantee that service will then thrive. Service needs to be translated to stakeholders in a way that articulates the usefulness it has for realizing institutional goals for effective teaching, relevant research, and engaged public service.

Recommendations for Practice

The findings from this study offer important lessons about the integration of service-learning and volunteerism. Following are some preliminary recommendations for people working at the campus level to integrate service more fully into campus life.

1. *Involve administrators, faculty, and students in conversations about service-learning.* Administrators are crucial to provide vision and support; thus they need to be well informed. Faculty are the arbiters of the curriculum and without their involvement and participation the success of an initiative that wants to find its way into the curriculum will be short-lived. Students also need to be informed about the integration of service-learning and volunteerism for they will be the front-runners in this initiative.

2. *Articulate clearly to all stakeholders what it means to promote the integration of service-learning and volunteerism and what is involved in joining an endeavor like Campus Compact.* Campus Compact is a membership organization of presidents. But the presidents, in most instances, are not the ones charged with pragmatically implementing the goals of service. It can be difficult to be an administrator or staff person charged with service, but then not have a clear picture of how to do that. Participants involved with the advancement of service-learning need to be involved and aware of their roles from the start.

3. *Work to integrate service into institutional structures (e.g., the curriculum, promotion and tenure guidelines) where*

possible. The greatest initiatives are doomed if they do not make it into the organizational structures. Including information about service-learning in faculty packets for newcomers tells faculty one thing (i.e., that this is one project going on among many we would like you to think about), and having language that rewards service-learning as a vehicle to enhance teaching, research, and service in tenure guidelines tells them another (i.e., your work in this area will be rewarded).

Conclusion

These recommendations will help garner support for service-learning and spread the vision for service on campus so that it is not perceived as an administrative undertaking. Campus Compact, both nationally and in the state, has undoubtedly planted seeds on many campuses including those described in this study. The campus-wide integration of service will take time and its success hinges on the clear articulation of how service is a vehicle to meet institutional goals and objectives.

Service-learning is not solely about good "P.R." for a campus. It is an integrated strategy that addresses the needs of students, faculty and the mission of the university. When we think of learning and higher education, we think of collaborative learning, problem solving, communication, a broadening of one's belief systems, the integration of knowledge, and lifelong learning. Service-learning transcends and encompasses all of these concerns. It provides a place and time where all students can belong, where the community is served and where research is

effective and applicable. The merits of service clearly warrant its integration. Future endeavors must work to get presidents to not just talk about their visions, but to enact them as well.

References

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boss, J. (1994). The effect of community service work on the moral development of college ethics students. Journal of Moral Education, 23, 183-197.

Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 67, 67-77.

Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2, 112-122.

Fairweather, J.S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. The Review of Higher Education, 17, 43-68.

Hatcher, J.A. & Bringle, R.G. (1996). Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning. Manuscript in preparation.

Hudson, W.E. & Trudeau, R.H. (1995). An essay on the institutionalization of service=learning: The genesis of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2, 150-58.

Liu, G. (1995). Reflections on the corporation's role. In M. Smith (ed.), Service counts: Lessons from the field of higher education (pp. 18-32). Providence, RI: Campus Compact/The Education Commission of the States.

Lynton, E.A. (1995). Making the case for professional service. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Morse, S.W. (1989). Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report #8. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.

Sagaria, M.A.D. & Burrows, J.M. (1995, April). Higher education urban community service: From periphery to core? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Ztlotkowski, E. (1996, January/February). A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy. Change, 21-27.